REMARKS

The Applicant requests consideration of this Supplemental Amendment.

By this Amendment, claims 23-32 are newly added. Currently pending claims 1
32 are believed allowable, with claims 1, 7, 11, 14, 18 and 21 being independent claims.

NEW CLAIMS:

Claim 23

By this Amendment, claim 23 is added to the application. Claim 23 recites, in part, "wherein the database is a cookie coordination database" and "wherein directing the client to access the resource at the second Web-Server includes sending the client a link to the second Web-Server." No new matter is believed to be introduced by this claim, and support for the claim limitations can be found at least at page 10, line 29 - page 11, line 1 and page 11, lines 9-11 in the Application. Furthermore, the Applicant submits that these limitations are not found in the cited art and that claim 23 is allowable for at least this reason.

Claim 24

By this Amendment, claim 24 is added to the application. Claim 24 recites, in part, "sending a HTTP response code from the first Web-Server configured to cause the client to be redirected to the second Web-Server using HTTP redirection." No new matter is believed to be introduced by this claim, and support for the claim limitations can be found at least at page 12, lines 11-16 in the Application. Furthermore, the Applicant submits that these limitations are not found in the cited art and that claim 24 is allowable for at least this reason.

Claim 25

By this Amendment, claim 25 is added to the application. Claim 25 recites, in part, "wherein the database is a cookie coordination database." No new matter is believed to be introduced by this claim, and support for the claim limitations can be found at least at page 10, line 29 - page 11, line 1 in the Application. Furthermore, the Applicant submits that these limitations are not found in the cited art and that claim 25 is allowable for at least this reason.

Claim 26

By this Amendment, claim 26 is added to the application. Claim 26 recites, in part, "sending a HTTP response code from the first web server configured to cause the client to be redirected to the second web server using HTTP redirection." No new matter is believed to be introduced by this claim, and support for the claim limitations can be found at least at page 12, lines 11-16 in the Application. Furthermore, the Applicant submits that these limitations are not found in the cited art and that claim 26 is allowable for at least this reason.

Claim 27

By this Amendment, claim 27 is added to the application. Claim 27 recites, in part, "wherein the database is a cookie coordination database" and "wherein means for the first web server directing the client to access the resource at the second web server includes means for sending the client a link to the second web server." No new matter is believed to be introduced by this claim, and support for the claim limitations can be found at least at page 10, line 29 - page 11, line 1 and page 11, lines 9-11 in the Application. Furthermore, the Applicant submits that these limitations are not found in the cited art and that claim 27 is allowable for at least this reason.

Claim 28

By this Amendment, claim 28 is added to the application. Claim 28 recites, in part, "means for sending a HTTP response code from the first web server configured to cause the client to be redirected to the second web server using HTTP redirection." No new matter is believed to be introduced by this claim, and support for the claim limitations can be found at least at page 12, lines 11-16 in the Application. Furthermore, the Applicant submits that these limitations are not found in the cited art and that claim 28 is allowable for at least this reason.

Claim 29

By this Amendment, claim 29 is added to the application. Claim 29 recites, in part, "wherein the database is a cookie coordination database" and "wherein directing the client to access the resource at the second user tracker includes sending the client a link to the resource." No new matter

is believed to be introduced by this claim, and support for the claim limitations can be found at least at page 10, line 29 - page 11, line 1 and page 11, lines 9-11 in the Application. Furthermore, the Applicant submits that these limitations are not found in the cited art and that claim 29 is allowable for at least this reason.

Claim 30

By this Amendment, claim 30 is added to the application. Claim 30 recites, in part, "sending a HTTP response code from the first user tracker configured to cause the client to be redirected to the second user tracker using HTTP redirection." No new matter is believed to be introduced by this claim, and support for the claim limitations can be found at least at page 12, lines 11-16 in the Application. Furthermore, the Applicant submits that these limitations are not found in the cited art and that claim 30 is allowable for at least this reason.

Claim 31

By this Amendment, claim 31 is added to the application. Claim 31 recites, in part, "sending a HTTP response code from the first web server configured to cause the client to be redirected to the second web server using HTTP redirection." No new matter is believed to be introduced by this claim, and support for the claim limitations can be found at least at page 12, lines 11-16 in the Application. Furthermore, the Applicant submits that these limitations are not found in the cited art and that claim 31 is allowable for at least this reason.

Claim 32

By this Amendment, claim 32 is added to the application. Claim 32 recites, in part, "wherein the redirector is configured to send a HTTP response code from the first web server configured to cause the client to be redirected to the second web server using HTTP redirection." No new matter is believed to be introduced by this claim, and support for the claim limitations can be found at least at page 12, lines 11-16 in the Application. Furthermore, the Applicant submits that these limitations are not found in the cited art and that claim 32 is allowable for at least this reason.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that this case is in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested. If any points remain at issue that the Examiner feels could best be resolved by a telephone interview, the Examiner is urged to contact the attorney below.

Please charge Deposit Account 50-0510 a fee of \$500 for the addition of ten new claims to the Application. No other fee is believed due with this Amendment, however, should such a fee be required please charge Deposit Account 50-0510. Should any extensions of time be required, please consider this a petition thereof and charge Deposit Account 50-0510 the required fee.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 15, 2005

Ico Tuchman, Reg. No. 45,924 Law Office of Ido Tuchman 69-60 108th Street, Suite 503 Forest Hills, NY 11375 Telephone (718) 544-1110 Facsimile (718) 544-8588